

REMARKS

Favorable consideration of this patent application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 have been subjected to a restriction requirement between Group I comprising Claims 1-9 drawn to a tool associated with a multi-chamber piston-cylinder, and Group II comprising Claims 10-24 drawn to a tool associated with a punch and die set. In addition, the claims of Group I have been subjected to an election of species between Species 1A drawn to Claims 1-5 readable on a multi-chamber piston driving assembly, and Species 1B drawn to Claims 6-9 readable on a cylindrical piston driving assembly. Still further, the claims of Group II have been subjected to an election of species between Species 2A drawn to Claims 10-15 readable on means mounting an integral insertion die holder and driving assembly, Species 2B drawn to Claims 16-20 readable on means mounted upon the base fixture, and Species 2C drawn to Claims 21-24 readable on cutter means mounted upon the base fixture.

Claim 25 has been inserted, and consequently, Claims 1-25 are now active in this patent application.

The aforementioned restriction requirement between the claims of Group I and Group II is hereby strenuously traversed upon several grounds. Firstly, it is noted that the examiner has characterized all of the Claims 1-9 of Group I as drawn to a tool associated with a multi-chamber piston cylinder, however, it is respectfully noted, for example, that Claims 6-9 do NOT at all recite a multi-chamber piston-cylinder assembly but simply a piston-cylinder assembly.

Secondly, it is noted, for example, that Claims 1, 6, 10, 16, and 21 all broadly recite the same structural components, such as, for example, the base fixture, the insertion die holder, and the driving assembly. Therefore, while the examiner has characterized Claims 10-24 as being drawn to a tool associated with a punch and die set, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-9 are likewise drawn to a tool associated with a punch and die set. Therefore, there are certainly significant similarities between the claims defining

the Group I and Group II sets of claims as set forth by the examiner.


Thirdly, and lastly, new Claim 25 has been inserted, and it is respectfully noted that Claim 25 is identical to Claim 16 with the exception that the driving assembly is recited as comprising a piston-cylinder driving assembly similar to that recited in Claim 6. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 25 comprises a linking claim, and in accordance with §809 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedures (MPEP), the linking claim must be examined along with the elected invention claims, and still further, if the linking claim is ultimately allowed, then the restriction requirement must be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the restriction requirement is not in fact proper, that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn, and that all of the claims of this patent application should be examined.

In compliance, however, with restriction requirement practice, and despite the aforementioned traversal of the restriction requirement, Applicants hereby provisionally elect to prosecute within the present patent application the invention of Group II comprising Claims 10-24, and still further, in connection with the election of Claims 10-24 of Group II, Applicants further elect Species 2B directed toward Claims 16-20.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this patent application is now in condition for examination on the merits, and an early and favorable action is now anticipated and awaited.

Respectfully Submitted,
ILLINOIS TOOL WORKS INC.



Paul F. Donovan
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,962
(847) 657-4075